A U M

Let not a man heed the perversities of others—their sins of omission and commission; but let him attend to what he himself has done amiss, and what left undone.
—DHAMMAPADA.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX | July, 1942 | No. 9

THE INNER VOICE

HOW shall a man know when it is Intuition that gives him counsel, and when, only the urgings of the lesser being, the personal self?

Often we expect a clear and unequivocal answer to such questions as these, forgetting that the difficulties men experience in understanding their own natures never lie in the obscurity of the Teacher's words, but in a secret unwillingness to sacrifice desire. The Truth cannot be hidden from one who is determined to find it. This is the first necessary realization for him who would hear the inner voice.

The lower self is protean in its deceptive personations, and peculiarly skilled in the art of adulteration. A man may adopt a noble ideal—perhaps the highest. Having done so, he should at once examine his feelings for the complacent self-satisfaction, however slight, that marks an intrusion of the personal. The almost subconscious process by which men smuggle into their scheme of ideals the pleasant compromises with desire goes on eternally; it will continue until the last vestige of selfishness has been destroyed. No one is exempt from such self-deception, least of all he who supposes himself to be the Exception.

The "reasoning" in this process is somewhat as follows. Says the lower man: "Behold your moral excellence in choosing this high path to tread. At what cost of sacrifice will you perform its duties, and with what extraordinary beneficence to lesser human kind! Surely, a foible or two will but prove that you are human like the rest. How unfortunate if men should place you on a pedestal!"

Proceeding: "Then, too, you *are* human, aren't you? After all, Rome wasn't built in a day. Rest content with fate. One must be

careful not to become a false ascetic. In fact, too much self-denial can be unwholesome. Above all, let us be *natural.*"

And so, the exceeding care not to be excessively "ascetic" ends in the same old indulgences, to which has been added the delusion of holiness. In time, because self-discipline plays no part in the life of such an one, he takes upon himself the responsibility of disciplining others. How sharp his eyes for the faults of others; how righteous his wrath, and loud his devotions to the common good! In his next incarnation he will be a priest or a politician.

The counsels of the inner voice are different from those of "our more intimate *astral,* or inner man, who is but too often the evil genius of the embodied entity called man." The true moral self never flinches or looks "the other way" during the painful task of self-examination. Conscience and Intuition do not deal in excuses; they know nothing of "extenuating circumstances." Nor is the inner voice ever condemnatory of others, for with the sins of others the *soul* is unconcerned. The soul knows what it has to do; where its power lies and where its responsibility ends.

The man who would hear the inner voice should learn what voice speaks in him, habitually. What typical converse has he with his fellows? Is he eternally "disgusted" with their stupidity, their ignorance,—their politics, perhaps? As he looks out upon the world, what does he see most of, and what are the terms chosen to describe what he sees? Let a man cease for a time from proving he is "right," and observe the spirit in which all this "rightness" is affirmed and defended. Perhaps the inner voice will speak to him, then.

There are certain absolute conditions, well known in occultism, which must be fulfilled before the voice of soul can be heard. Because these conditions are *spiritual,* they sometimes seem faraway and impractical. They are indeed "unworldly," from the personal point of view, yet they must be understood, and maintained, before there is even a beginning in the life of Soul.

But once a man assumes the position of the true disciple, forgetting self, and seeing all others as brother souls, a great weight falls away from his psychic nature; he begins to taste spiritual freedom. Like a strong breeze from mountain heights, a new and refreshing current of inspiration enters his being. Yesterday's cares are like the tears of childhood, brushed away and forgotten. A hope, founded on nothing on earth, is born; the hope that never dies, for it is rooted in spirit. The world's turmoil dies away, and the wordless song of the soul sounds in the heart. Never again is asked the question, How shall I know when the inner voice speaks?

MESMERISM

["Mesmerism," together with "Sheaths of the Soul," which THEOSOPHY will reprint in August, show William Q. Judge as the occult scientist. Here is the psycho-physiology of the future, for which no facts will be "sacred," none "profane." All particulars will be seen as applications of universal doctrines.

These two articles treat more fully of the astral body than any other Theosophical writings. Of the scientific necessity for the concept of the astral body, H. P. Blavatsky has written: *"The whole issue of the quarrel between the profane and the esoteric sciences depends upon the belief in, and demonstration of, the existence of an astral body within the physical,* the former independent of the latter." (*S. D.* II, 149.) In the light of these fundamental propositions on the nature, powers and uses of the astral principle in man, the recent series of historical studies on the astral body may be viewed with profit. (See THEOSOPHY XXVIII, Nos. 3-10.) "Mesmerism" first appeared in *Lucifer* for May, 1892.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

THIS is the name given to an art, or the exhibition of a power to act upon others and the facility to be acted upon, which long antedate the days of Anton Mesmer. Another name for some of its phenomena is Hypnotism, and still another is Magnetism. The last title was given because sometimes the person operated on was seen to follow the hand of the operator, as if drawn like iron filings to a magnet. These are all used today by various operators, but by many different appellations it has been known; fascination is one, and psychologizing is another, but the number of them is so great it is useless to go over the list.

Anton Mesmer, who gave greater publicity in the Western world to the subject than any other person, and whose name is still attached to it, was born in 1734, and some few years before 1783, or about 1775, obtained great prominence in Europe in connection with his experiments and cures; but, as H. P. Blavatsky says in her *Theosophical Glossary,* he was only a rediscoverer. The whole subject had been explored long before his time—indeed many centuries anterior to the rise of civilization in Europe—and all the great fraternities of the East were always in full possession of secrets concerning its practice which remain still unknown. Mesmer came out with his discoveries as agent, in fact—though, perhaps, without disclosing those behind him—of certain brotherhoods to which he belonged. His promulgations were in the last quarter of the century, just as those of the Theosophical Society were begun in 1875, and what he did was all that could be done at that time.

But in 1639, one hundred years before Mesmer, a book was published in Europe upon the use of mesmerism in the cure of wounds, and bore the title, *The Sympathetical Powder of Edricius Mohynus of Eburo.* These cures, it was said, could be effected at a distance from the wound by reason of the *virtue* or *directive faculty* between that and the wound. This is exactly one of the phases of both hypnotism and mesmerism. And along the same line were the writings of a monk named Uldericus Balk, who said diseases could be similarly cured, in a book concerning the lamp of life in 1611. In these works, of course, there is much superstition, but they treat of mesmerism underneath all the folly.

After the French Academy committee, including Benjamin Franklin, passed sentence on the subject, condemning it in substance, mesmerism fell into disrepute, but was revived in America by many persons who adopted different names for their work and wrote books on it. One of them named Dodds obtained a good deal of celebrity, and was invited during the life of Daniel Webster to lecture on it before a number of United States senators. He called his system "psychology," but it was mesmerism exactly, even to details regarding nerves and the like. And in England also a good deal of attention was given to it by numbers of people who were not of scientific repute. They gave it no better reputation than it had before, and the press and public generally looked on them as charlatans and upon mesmerism as a delusion. Such was the state of things until the researches into what is now known as hynotism brought that phase of the subject once more forward, and subsequently to 1875 the popular mind gave more and more attention to the possibilities in the fields of clairvoyance, clairaudience, trance, apparitions, and the like. Even physicians and others, who previously scouted all such investigations, began to take them up for consideration, and are still engaged thereon. And it seems quite certain that, by whatever name designated, mesmerism is sure to have more and more attention paid to it. For it is impossible to proceed very far with hypnotic experiments without meeting mesmeric phenomena, and being compelled, as it were, to proceed with an enquiry into those as well.

The hypnotists unjustifiably claim the merit of discoveries, for even the uneducated so-called charlatans of the above-mentioned periods cited the very fact appropriated by hypnotists, that many persons were normally—for them—in a hypnotized state, or, as they called it, in a psychologized condition, or negative one, and so forth, according to the particular system employed.

In France Baron Du Potet astonished everyone with his feats in mesmerism, bringing about as great changes in subjects as the hypnotizers do now. After a time, and after reading old books, he adopted a number of queer symbols that he said had the most extraordinary effect on the subject, and refused to give these out to any except pledged persons. This rule was violated, and his instructions and figures were printed not many years ago for sale with a pretense of secrecy consisting in a lock to the book. I have read these and find they are of no moment at all, having their force simply from the will of the person who uses them. The Baron was a man of very strong natural mesmeric force, and made his subjects do things that few others could bring about. He died without causing the scientific world to pay much attention to the matter.

The great question mooted is whether there is or is not any actual fluid thrown off by the mesmerizer. Many deny it, and nearly all hypnotizers refuse to admit it. H. P. Blavatsky declares there is such a fluid, and those who can see into the plane to which it belongs assert its existence as a subtle form of matter. This is, I think, true, and is not at all inconsistent with the experiments in hypnotism, for the fluid can have its own existence at the same time that people may be self-hypnotized by merely inverting their eyes while looking at some bright object. This fluid is composed in part of the astral substance around every one, and in part of the physical atoms in a finely divided state. By some this astral substance is called the *aura*. But that word is indefinite, as there are many sorts of aura and many degrees of its expression. These will not be known, even to Theosophists of the most willing mind, until the race as a whole has developed up to that point. So the word will remain in use for the present.

This aura, then, is thrown off by the mesmerizer upon his subject, and is received by the latter in a department of his inner constitution, never described by any Western experimenters, because they know nothing of it. It wakes up certain inner and non-physical divisions of the person operated on, causing a change of relation between the various and numerous sheaths surrounding the inner man, and making possible different degrees of intelligence and of clairvoyance and the like. It has no influence whatsoever on the Higher Self,* which it is impossible to reach by such means. Many persons are deluded into supposing that the Higher Self is the responder, or that some spirit or what not is present, but it is only one of the many inner persons, so to say, who is talking or rather causing the organs of

*Âtmâ, in its vehicle Buddhi. [Ed.]

speech to do their office. And it is just here that the Theosophist and the non-Theosophist are at fault, since the words spoken are sometimes far above the ordinary intelligence or power of the subject in waking state. I therefore propose to give in the rough the theory of what actually does take place, as has been known for ages to those who see with the inner eye, and as will one day be discovered and admitted by science.

When the hypnotic or mesmerized state is complete—and often when it is partial—there is an immediate paralyzing of the power of the body to throw its impressions, and thus modify the conceptions of the inner being. In ordinary waking life everyone, without being able to disentangle himself, is subject to the impressions from the whole organism; that is to say, every cell in the body, to the most minute, has its own series of impressions and recollections, all of which continue to impinge on the great register, the brain, until the impression remaining in the cell is fully exhausted. And that exhaustion takes a long time. Further, as we are adding continually to them, the period of disappearance of impression is indefinitely postponed. Thus the inner person is not able to make itself felt. But, in the right subject, those bodily impressions are by mesmerism neutralized for the time, and at once another effect follows, which is equivalent to cutting the general off from his army and compelling him to seek other means of expression.

The brain—in cases where the subject talks—is left free sufficiently to permit it to obey the commands of the mesmerizer and compel the organs of speech to respond. So much in general.

We have now come to another part of the nature of man which is a land unknown to the Western world and its scientists. By mesmerism other organs are set to work disconnected from the body, but which in normal state function with and through the latter. These are not admitted by the world, but they exist, and are as real as the body is—in fact some who know say they are more real and less subject to decay, for they remain almost unchanged from birth to death. These organs have their own currents, circulation if you will, and methods of receiving and storing impressions. They are those which in a second of time seize and keep the faintest trace of any object or word coming before the waking man. They not only keep them but very often give them out, and when the person is mesmerized their exit is untrammelled by the body.

They are divided into many classes and grades, and each one of them has a whole series of ideas and facts peculiar to itself, as well as centres in the ethereal body to which they relate. Instead now of

the brain's dealing with the sensations of the body, it deals with something quite different, and reports what these inner organs see in any part of space to which they are directed. And in place of your having waked up the Higher Self, you have merely uncovered one of the many sets of impressions and experiences of which the inner man is composed, and who is himself a long distance from the Higher Self. These varied pictures, thus seized from every quarter, are normally overborne by the great roar of the physical life, which is the sum total of possible expression of a normal being on the physical plane whereon we move. They show themselves usually only by glimpses when we have sudden ideas or recollections, or in dreams when our sleeping may be crowded with fancies for which we cannot find a basis in daily life. Yet the basis exists, and is always some one or other of the million small impressions of the day passed unnoticed by the physical brain, but caught unerringly by means of other sensoriums belonging to our astral double. For this astral body, or double, permeates the physical one as colour does the bowl of water. And although to the materialistic conceptions of the present day such a misty shadow is not admitted to have parts, powers, and organs, it nevertheless has all of these with a surprising power and grasp. Although perhaps a mist, it can exert under proper conditions a force equal to the viewless wind when it levels to earth the proud constructions of puny man.

In the astral body, then, is the place to look for the explanation of mesmerism and hypnotism. The Higher Self will explain the flights we seldom make into the realm of spirit, and is the God—the Father—within who guides His children up the long steep road to perfection. Let not the idea of it be degraded by chaining it to the low floor of mesmeric phenomena, which any healthy man or woman can bring about if they will only try. The grosser the operator the better, for thus there is more of the mesmeric force, and if it be the Higher Self that is affected, then the meaning of it would be that gross matter can with ease affect and deflect the high spirit—and this is against the testimony of the ages.

A Paramahansa of the Himâlayas has put in print the following words: "Theosophy is that branch of Masonry which shows the Universe in the form of an egg." Putting on one side the germinal spot in the egg, we have left five other main divisions: the fluid, the yolk, the skin of the yolk, the inner skin of the shell, and the hard shell. The shell and the inner skin may be taken as one. That leaves us four, corresponding to the old divisions of fire, air, earth, and water. Man, roughly speaking, is divided in the same manner, and

from these main divisions spring all his manifold experiences on the outer and the introspective planes. The human structure has its skin, its blood, its earthy matter—called bones for the moment, its flesh, and lastly the great germ which is insulated somewhere in the brain by means of a complete coat of fatty matter.

The skin includes the mucous, all membranes in the body, the arterial coats, and so on. The flesh takes in the nerves, the animal cells so-called, and the muscles. The bones stand alone. The blood has its cells, the corpuscles, and the fluid they float in. The organs, such as the liver, the spleen, the lungs, include skin, blood, and mucous. Each of these divisions and all of their subdivisions have their own peculiar impressions and recollections, and all, together with the coördinator the brain, make up the man as he is on the visible plane.

These all have to do with the phenomena of mesmerism, although there are those who may think it not possible that mucous membrane or skin can give us any knowledge. But it is nevertheless the fact, for the sensations of every part of the body affect each cognition, and when the experiences of the skin cells, or any other, are most prominent before the brain of the subject, all his reports to the operator will be drawn from that, unknown to both, and put into language for the brain's use so long as the next condition is not reached. This is the Esoteric Doctrine, and will at last be found true. For man is made up of millions of lives, and from these, unable of themselves to act rationally or independently, he gains ideas, and as the master of all puts those ideas, together with others from higher planes, into thought, word, and act. Hence at the very first step in mesmerism this factor has to be remembered, but nowadays people do not know it and cannot recognize its presence, but are carried away by the strangeness of the phenomena.

The very best of subjects are mixed in their reports, because the things they do see are varied and distorted by the several experiences of the parts of their nature I have mentioned, all of which are constantly clamouring for a hearing. And every operator is sure to be misled by them unless he is himself a trained seer.

The next step takes us into the region of the inner man, not the spiritual being, but the astral one who is the model on which the outer visible form is built. The inner person is the mediator between mind and matter. Hearing the commands of mind, he causes the physical nerves to act and thus the whole body. All the senses have their seat in this person, and every one of them is a thousand-fold more extensive in range than their outer representatives, for those

outer eyes and ears, and sense of touch, taste, and smell, are only gross organs which the inner ones use, but which of themselves can do nothing.

This can be seen when we cut off the nerve connection, say from the eye, for then the inner eye cannot connect with physical nature and is unable to see an object placed before the retina, although feeling or hearing may in their way apprehend the object if those are not also cut off.

These inner senses can perceive under certain conditions to any distance regardless of position or obstacle. But they cannot see everything, nor are they always able to properly understand the nature of everything they do see. For sometimes that appears to them with which they are not familiar. And further, they will often report having seen what they are desired by the operator to see, when in fact they are giving unreliable information. For, as the astral senses of any person are the direct inheritance of his own prior incarnations, and are not the product of family heredity, they cannot transcend their own experience, and hence their cognitions are limited by it, no matter how wonderful their action appears to him who is using only the physical sense-organs. In the ordinary healthy person these astral senses are inextricably linked with the body and limited by the apparatus which it furnishes during the waking state. And only when one falls asleep, or into a mesmerized state, or trance, or under the most severe training, can they act in a somewhat independent manner. This they do in sleep, when they live another life than that compelled by the force and the necessities of the waking organism. And when there is a paralyzation of the body by the mesmeric fluid they can act, because the impressions from the physical cells are inhibited.

The mesmeric fluid brings this paralyzing about by flowing from the operator and creeping steadily over the whole body of the subject, *changing the polarity of the cells in every part* and thus disconnecting the outer from the inner man. As the whole system of physical nerves is sympathetic in all its ramifications, when certain major sets of nerves are affected others by sympathy follow into the same condition. So it often happens with mesmerized subjects that the arms or legs are suddenly paralyzed without being directly operated on, or, as frequently, the sensation due to the fluid is felt first in the fore-arm, although the head was the only place touched.

There are many secrets about this part of the process, but they will not be given out, as it is easy enough for all proper purposes to mesmerize a subject by following what is already publicly known. By means of certain nerve points located near the skin the whole system

of nerves may be altered in an instant, even by a slight breath from the mouth at a distance of eight feet from the subject. But modern books do not point this out.

When the paralyzing and change of polarity of the cells are complete the astral man is almost disconnected from the body. Has he any structure? What mesmerizer knows? How many probably will deny that he has any structure at all? Is he only a mist, an idea? And yet, again, how many subjects are trained so as to be able to analyze their own astral anatomy?

But the structure of the inner astral man is definite and coherent. It cannot be fully dealt with in a magazine article, but may be roughly set forth, leaving readers to fill in the details.

Just as the outer body has a spine which is the column whereon the being sustains itself with the brain at the top, so the astral body has its spine and brain. It is material, for it is made of matter, however finely divided, and is not of the nature of the spirit.

After the maturity of the child before birth this form is fixed, coherent, and lasting, undergoing but small alteration from that day until death. And so also as to its brain; that remains unchanged until the body is given up, and does not, like the outer brain, give up cells to be replaced by others from hour to hour. These inner parts are thus more permanent than the outer correspondents to them. Our material organs, bones, and tissues are undergoing change each instant. They are suffering always what the ancients called "the constant momentary dissolution of minor units of matter," and hence within each month there is a perceptible change by way of diminution or accretion. This is not the case with the inner form. It alters only from life to life, being constructed at the time of reincarnation to last for a whole period of existence. For it is the model fixed by the present evolutionary proportions for the outer body. It is the collector, as it were, of the visible atoms which make us as we outwardly appear. So at birth it is potentially of a certain size, and when that limit is reached it stops the further extension of the body, making possible what are known today as average weights and average sizes. At the same time the outer body is kept in shape by the inner one until the period of decay. And this decay, followed by death, is not due to bodily disintegration *per se,* but to the fact that the term of the astral body is reached, when it is no longer able to hold the outer frame intact. Its power to resist the impact and war of the material molecules being exhausted, the sleep of death supervenes.

Now, as in our physical form the brain and spine are centres for nerves, so in the other there are the nerves which ramify from the inner brain and spine all over the structure. All of these are related to every organ in the outer visible body. They are more in the nature of currents than nerves, as we understand the word, and may be called *astro-nerves*. They move in relation to such great centres in the body outside, as the heart, the pit of the throat, umbilical centre, spleen, and sacral plexus. And here, in passing, it may be asked of the Western mesmerizers what do they know of the use and power, if any, of the umbilical centre? They will probably say it has no use in particular after the accomplishment of birth. But the true science of mesmerism says there is much yet to be learned even on that one point; and there is no scarcity, in the proper quarters, of records as to experiments on, and use of, this centre.

The astro-spinal column has three great nerves of the same sort of matter. They may be called ways or channels, up and down which the forces play, that enable man inside and outside to stand erect, to move, to feel, and to act. In description they answer exactly to the magnetic fluids, that is, they are respectively positive, negative, and neutral, their regular balance being essential to sanity. When the astral spine reaches the inner brain the nerves alter and become more complex, having a final great outlet in the skull. Then, with these two great parts of the inner person are the other manifold sets of nerves of similar nature related to the various planes of sensation in the visible and invisible worlds. These all then constitute the personal actor within, and in these is the place to seek for the solution of the problems presented by mesmerism and hypnotism.

Disjoin this being from the outer body with which he is linked, and the divorce deprives him of freedom temporarily, making him the slave of the operator. But mesmerizers know very well that the subject can and does often escape from control, puzzling them often, and often giving them fright. This is testified to by all the best writers in the Western schools.

Now this inner man is not by any means omniscient. He has an understanding that is limited by his own experience, as said before. Therefore, error creeps in if we rely on what he says in the mesmeric trance as to anything that requires philosophical knowledge, except with rare cases that are so infrequent as not to need consideration now. For neither the limit of the subject's power to know, nor the effect of the operator on the inner sensoriums described above, is known to operators in general, and especially not by those who do not accept the ancient division of the inner nature of man. The effect

of the operator is almost always to colour the reports made by the subject.

Take an instance: A. was a mesmerizer of C., a very sensitive woman, who had never made philosophy a study. A. had his mind made up to a certain course of procedure concerning other persons and requiring argument. But before action he consulted the sensitive, having in his possession a letter from X., who is a very definite thinker and very positive; while A., on the other hand, was not definite in idea although a good physical mesmerizer. The result was that the sensitive, after falling into the trance and being asked on the question debated, gave the views of X., whom she had not known, and so strongly that A. changed his plan although not his conviction, not knowing that it was the influence of the ideas of X. then in his mind, that had deflected the understanding of the sensitive. The thoughts of X., being very sharply cut, were enough to entirely change any previous views the subject had. What reliance, then, can be placed on untrained seers? And all the mesmeric subjects we have are wholly untrained, in the sense that the word bears with the school of ancient mesmerism of which I have been speaking.

The processes used in mesmeric experiment need not be gone into here. There are many books declaring them, but after studying the matter for the past twenty-two years, I do not find that they do other than copy one another, and that the entire set of directions can, for all practical purposes, be written on a single sheet of paper. But there are many other methods of still greater efficiency anciently taught, that may be left for another occasion.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F. T. S.

PLASTIC POWER OF SOUL

The consequence of our soul's pre-existence is more agreeable to reason than any other hypothesis whatever; has been received by the most learned philosophers of all ages, there being scarcely any of them that held the soul of man immortal upon the mere light of Nature and reason, but asserted also her pre-existence. . . . [The soul is a] spirit endued with sense and reason, and *a power of organizing terrestrial matter into human shape* by vital union therewith . . . the frame of the body, of which I think it most reasonable to conclude the soul herself to be the more particular architect (for I will not wholly reject Plotinus his opinion), and that the plastick power resides in her, as also in the souls of brute animals, as very worthy and learned writers have determined. —HENRY MORE.

THE PARABLE OF THE WEEDS

THE pessimistically inclined, possibly a growing host, may agree that the New York judge who recently ruled that it was unlawful to pull weeds in the park without a permit, provided an emblem for the stubborn inertia of Humanity in general. Torn between the pushing and pulling of various would-be reformers, finding radicals on the right of him and radicals on the left of him, the average man seems to concentrate all the more doggedly on preserving the *status quo*.

Many a social worker and public teacher, not a few sincere clergymen and scientific discoverers, political philosophers and social economists, in short, all Bachelors of the Humane Science of Brotherhood, have had to ask more than once, and with all the eloquence at their command, for *permission* to pull up "weeds." Nay, if they received grudging assent, and happily busied themselves extracting the undesirables, they may have come back to find the weeded plot freshly planted—with new weeds, or to discover the old ones carefully replaced.

Then it is wondered by some who hear of the power of Adepts, why They do not step in and set the world on its feet, instead of allowing man to destroy himself in an apparently fruitless attempt to restore balance. Is the explanation obscure? Could it not be assumed that the Wise Ones know how fleeting would be the harmony thus established? Certainly the experiment has been tried again and again. Instance the king in days of old who, on approaching the end of his life, decided to do away with the extremes of rich and poor. He thereupon instituted a sweeping reform which left all his subjects with equal portions of the common wealth. Ideal? Yes, but in ten years he had it all to do over. The erstwhile rich were richer than before, and the poor poorer. A second trial also failed to abolish economic distinctions.

For almost every man there is another example in his own experience. Who does not know the fond parent who, having come up the hard way, decides that Junior shall never know the trials he has experienced, shall never suffer an unfulfilled desire? Has the son, raised in "perfect" home and school conditions, the strong and respected character of his father? Not unless Junior was endowed with tremendous karmic stamina to withstand the stultifying influences of a pre-fabricated environment. Not unless he had brought through *positive* virtue, to supplement and sustain a mere thoughtless goodness.

What is this human inertia? Why do men require the friction of suffering for progress? Why is perpetual rest on this plane as impossible as perpetual motion? Consider the theosophical fundamentals. First, the wheel of life is in Ceaseless Motion; second, its outer rim revolves around the unmoving hub, now touching ground, now riding high; third, the wheel, by virtue of the solid earth beneath and the unresisting air above, gains a forward momentum. Man is the eternal being. His acquired nature is the rim of the wheel, constantly impressing and being impressed by the conditions it contacts, ever coming and going in respect to the surface it is traversing. His motion, in common with that of all nature, is in general forward, but at any particular moment in Time's eternity, he may be seen to move in an individual direction. That direction may be forward, but it may also be backward, or sideways, depending on his voluntary efforts. It is the law that these efforts must be self-determined. This is the occasion for man's free-will. Its negative implication is independence from any outside savior, as from domination by any person, place or thing. Its positive implication is self-reliance, the ability to stand alone. Politically, it is the desire for freedom; socially, the tendency toward distinctions of class; economically, the urge to achieve personal security. It is the motif of life's all-over pattern.

It has been said that every nation wants to reform the world,—beginning with that country over there. Thus each man wants to reform humanity, beginning with anybody else but himself. As a verse by G. K. Chesterton has it:

> "The villas and the chapels where
> With very little labor,
> We learn to 'love our fellow-man'
> And hate our next-door neighbor."

The principle involved here is crucial. It is the "heresy of separateness" travelling *incognito*. If we were consistent we would be just as respectful of the integrity of others as we are jealous of our own. We would protect others from the intrusion of our habits, desires, ideas or aims with all the fervor, not to say ferocity, we employ in asserting our "independence." Revolutionary tactics, whether used in public or in private, are coërcive, and appeal not coolly to the judgment and reason of man, but heatedly, to the "moving passions." The crystal's precise perfection and complete orderliness are possible only at absolute zero; as the temperature is raised, various types of disorder set in. So with human society.

The judge's decision is an emblem, but a bittersweet one. It carries both responsibility and hope. No one citizen can weed out

Society's misfits and nuisances, for we are not responsible for the duty of another. But there *is* hope, because the individual knows, if he cultivates and purifies his own corner, that he is making a unique contribution, the greatest possible, to the revival and survival, on earth, of the Garden of the Gods.

Do We Remember?

Why not own up to it? We have all, at certain moments, skirted those unknown regions wherein the shades flutter and vanish, exhausted by the ecstasy of their own souvenirs. Tell me, have you never on a mystic evening of the autumn, when the rain fell softly in the sand and rustled on the trees, come upon a house on the rim of a forest that immediately evoked the memory of other times and another life? You really believe you know that house—you would swear you had lived in it. The smell of a woodfire, the sight of a row of willows reflected in the water, or the presence of mushrooms or moss-covered rocks sets you suddenly, impetuously, off on a trail and permits you to go back into your own past or into that of one of your ancestors, who, without having lived in such a place, perhaps nourished the hope of living there some day.

How can I explain that on my first visit to London, as an immigrant boy in passage to Canada, I knew (and said so to my traveling companions with whom I was strolling about) that around the next corner we would see the Guild-hall and, in that obscure passage in Threadneedle Street, we would find the Church of the Austin Friars in the English capital? Still, I had never been to the city before, nor had I ever studied its street plan.

And then, this small park with the royal mausoleum where I now paused a moment, why, of all the parks in Paris, had it always drawn me so ineluctably?

Why did it always bring back a vision of a patio where olive-skinned women with large golden earrings and necklaces of gold walked about exchanging confidences in a low voice? How often have I not looked up from a book or a newspaper in that garden, thinking I heard the sound of bare little feet pattering on cool paving stones, only to find that the hatchet-faced keeper was merely making his rounds. Whence had come that silvery children's laughter I heard? . . .

—Pierre van Paassen.

THEOSOPHIST UNAWARE

II: Bronson Alcott, the Educator

BRONSON ALCOTT'S ideas on education, religion, government, and society in general, have never been published in systematic form, but references to his social philosophy appear in the books of his daughter, Louisa May Alcott, who, as she said, made "the childish fiction of the daughter play the grateful part of herald to the wise and beautiful truths of the father."

Thus "Plumfield," in Louisa's *Little Men* (1871), followed part of the plan of Alcott's Temple School. Persistent inquiry from readers as to whether there ever was or could be such an ideal school as "Plumfield" led Louisa to propose a new edition of the *Record of a School,* first printed forty years before. (The *Record* was based on the journals kept by Elizabeth P. Peabody during the time she was Alcott's assistant at the Temple School in Boston.)

The *Record* illustrated Alcott's application of his educational principles. Miss Peabody writes that Bronson Alcott believed children should share with their teachers a clearly defined aim and objective—right action. He was not interested in memory work, she says, but was determined to arouse the children's intuition and imagination. For this and many other reasons, study of Alcott as an educator is a particular inspiration to theosophists, who have the key to a "proper and truly theosophical education" in H. P. Blavatsky's words:

> Children should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves. We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties, and latent capacities. We would endeavour to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes should find their full natural development. We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish. (Key To Theosophy.)*

Alcott told his scholars in the Temple School that "it was one of his great objects to call forth the soul in action, to govern the body," and that "the object of this school was to unveil the soul; and he was glad to hear that one of the scholars had said, out of school, that it was impossible to remain in it, and not learn to know one's self." He told his class:

> Until you feel that you have a spirit within you, and must act according to it, you will never be free from those thoughts and feelings and actions that trouble you and us so much every day. If I did not think there was something within you much more angelic than has yet appeared, I should feel very despairing. If I thought of you as you think of yourself, I should be as discouraged as you are. You think you are good enough; but I believe you can be a great deal better.

On another occasion, Alcott declared, "You come here to learn how to behave at home; I do not mean to learn how to make bows and courtesies, but to feel and think better." On education in general, he said:

> It is the part of the wise instructor to tempt forth from the minds of his pupils the facts of their inmost consciousness, and make them apprehend the gifts and faculties of their own being. Education, when rightly understood, will be found to lie in the art of asking apt and fit questions, and in thus leading the mind by its own light to the perception of truth. . . .

Of the fifty-eight "General Maxims by Which to Regulate the Instructor's Practice in Instruction," set down by Alcott in his journal for 1826-7, the following are of special interest:

> I. To teach, with a sense of the accountableness of the profession.
>
> V. To teach, as the former of character, and the promoter of the collective happiness of man.
>
> VIII. To teach, with charitable feelings toward all rational and animal beings.
>
> XIII. To teach nothing, merely from subservience to custom.
>
> XIV. To teach with unremitted solicitude, and faithfulness.
>
> XV. To teach, appreciating the value of the beings to whom Instruction is given.
>
> XXXVIII. To teach, endeavouring to preserve the understanding from implicit belief, and to secure the habit of independence of thought and feeling.

Self-control, or mastery by the higher nature of the lower animal tendencies, he showed to be a practical aim of education. He unfailingly provided his pupils with a rational basis for the ethical conduct he sought to foster.

He read to the children the story of how Elijah sweetened the springs of water, suggesting

> that this might teach us how to begin to change a character; you must change its sources. And he said that was the way he began to educate this school. He did not begin by teaching them to read and study; but he went to the sources; he began by trying to make the feelings and way of thinking, right; he put salt into the spring,—not table salt, but the salt of instruction. They all looked pleased.

He used the teaching of attention and concentration to illustrate the meaning of self-discipline, explaining to the children that their effort to pay attention *is* self-control. His assistant records that "those who commonly instruct children would be astonished to witness the degree of attention which Mr. Alcott succeeds in obtaining from his scholars constantly. Indeed the majority of adults might envy them. It is, generally speaking, complete, profound, and as continuous as any would wish the attention of children to be." Again, "Mr. Alcott is so thoroughly convinced that all effectual government must be self-government, that he much prefers that all the operations of school should obviously stand still than that they should apparently go on while really standing still or going back in any individual instance."

"Mr. Alcott requires them to seem attentive, as well as to be attentive," says Miss Peabody, and "every day, before they turn in their seats, he reminds them that it can be done without noise." On one occasion, hearing a sound, "Alcott turned to the boy that made it, and said that the greatest and most powerful things made no noise. Did you ever hear the sun make a noise? There was immediately a profound stillness."

Miss Peabody's book reveals that the Father of "Little Women" was no ordinary teacher:

> . . . knowledge is chaff of itself; but you have taken the knowledge and used it to govern yourselves, and to make yourselves better. If I thought I gave you knowledge only, and could not lead you to use it to make yourselves better, I would never enter this schoolroom again.

Alcott "introduced punishment by name, and found that, in theorizing on the subject with his scholars, there was a general feeling of its desirableness and necessity; and he never failed in obtaining their consent to it as a general principle." He once asked them, "Is it not better to hurt the body than to let the mind go neglected?" They all said, "Yes." At a later day, having "adverted to the necessity of pain, in a general point of view, and brought them to acknowledge the uses of this hurting of the body (as he always phrased it) in concentrating the attention, etc., he said that he should have it administered upon his own hand for a time, instead of theirs, but that the guilty person must do it. They declared that they would never do it. They said they preferred being punished themselves. But he determined that they should not escape the pain and shame of administering the stroke upon him, except by being themselves blameless." "On the morning this was announced," the *Record* relates, "there was a profound stillness. Boys who had never been

affected before, and to whom bodily punishment was a very small affair, as far as its pain was concerned, were completely sobered. . . . This is the most complete punishment that a master ever invented, was the observation of one of the boys at home; Mr. Alcott has secured obedience now; there is not a boy in school but what would a great deal rather be punished himself than punish him. . . . A new sense of the worth and importance of that for which *he* was willing to suffer pain seemed to spring up all around, while the unquestionable generosity of it was not only understood, but felt to be contagious." This account in the *Record* suggests the basis for the dramatic incident in *Little Men,* where Nat is punished for telling a "white" lie.

Thus Alcott's first principle of education was to teach children what they are—that they are Souls or Spirits using different faculties, among them the Mind. He related every subject to this point. Arithmetic, Geography, Music, Physical Training, English, punishment, everything was discussed with the children to bring out the fact that they, the Souls, were the Creators, Observers.

Shepard has remarked: "It was a foible of Alcott's mind always to go from particulars to universals." These universals are stated many times in Alcott's writings. The following are taken from various sources:

> I set out from the ground of Spirit. This *is*. All else is its manifestation.
>
> Spirit! 'tis the architect of nature . . . Life is its work. It clothes itself in Nature then anon it casts aside its robe. . . .
>
> Body is Spirit at its circumference. It denotes its confines to the external sense; it individualizes, defines Spirit, breaks the Unity into Multiplicity and places under the vision of man parts of the great Whole which, standing thus separate, can be taken in by the mind—too feeble to apprehend the whole at once and requiring all save an individual thing to be excluded at a single view. Infinitude is too wide for man to take in. He is therefore permitted to take in portions and spread his vision over the wide circumference little by little; and in these portions doth the Infinite shadow forth itself, God in all and all in God.
>
> Matter is in constant flux—ebb and flow; nothing abides.
>
> The human soul has had a primordial experience in the infinite Spirit. The infinite is embodied in the finite, to be developed and returned again to the source of infinite energy from whence it sprang. This is spiritual and earthly experience, and all the phenomena of humanity arise from the union and evolution of these elements. The finite is but the return of the soul on the path of the infinite—the wheeling orb attracted toward, and yet preserved in the cycle of, the central sphere.

> Instinct presides over the duplex life of the Soul. It underlies all the phenomena both of matter and mind. Instinct builds organizations. It is primal, initial, spontaneous Life. It organizes, replenishes, analyzes, comprehends, decomposes, and wastes every structure of nature, which it constructs and consumes. Every function of Instinct, through all the tribes and orders of nature, symbolizes the transcendent glory of the Soul, and indicates its supremacy over organizations, which it constructs, preserves, and razes. It is the architect of nature.
>
> Spirit is the sublime architect of Nature, and man the *chef d'oeuvre* of its art. Spirit buildeth all things. Renovation is its working, and time its work-day. Matter is the element upon which it works and with which, by an undetected skill, it forms itself the Ideal which it hath preconceived.

Elizabeth Peabody thought the (apparently unwelcome) accusation that Alcott taught reincarnation in his Temple School important enough to give it notice in the *Explanatory* which she added to the second edition of the *Record.* Her first argument, in support of her former head, was that he did not teach any doctrine of pre-existence except that taught by Wordsworth (in his Ode on Immortality), Plato, and Jesus Christ (!). But the real reply to such allegations is contained in her next sentence: "But even this doctrine Mr. Alcott has never taught dogmatically. It has come out spontaneously from the children themselves, and, almost invariably, as soon as they come to see the divine nature of the conscience and the sentiments."

In 1852 we find Alcott writing this thought in his Journal: "The child's body is a recollection of ancestral particles from seven generations preceding; the like of its mind's memories also. All instincts are recollections of foregone lives." Earlier he refers to the "survival of foregone periods" in himself.

After reading from Wordsworth's Ode on Immortality, he shut the book and asked the children separately what each understood by birth:

> Some expressed the idea that the soul shaped and made the body; others that the body was made, and the soul put into it. Which is right? said one boy. That is more than I can tell, but I incline to the first opinion. You are all nearly right, however; you have the important ideas; birth is not the beginning of the spirit; life is the remembrance, or a waking up of spirit. All the life of knowledge is the waking up of what is already within. . . . But birth is sometimes the prelude to the death of the soul, said Mr. Alcott. How? said one boy. Because the soul becomes the slave of the body; is governed, darkened, shut up, and buried in it; and it is necessary that it should be born again, born out of the body. . . . Now can you understand this,—that *the soul* is a seed placed in the midst of the world, repre-

sented by the ground; and that the shoots which go down into the earth, to fasten the plant in the earth awhile, are the bodily feelings and appetites;—and that the shoots which go upward towards the light, are the affections and better feelings that seek Heaven? They said, Yes. Well, suppose that more of the seed shoots downward than is necessary; and that no shoots go upward; would there be any flower and fruit? No. It would all be *root;* all would be under the earth. Well, can you understand that if the soul loves the body only, and uses its animal appetites, and does not seek the light and Heaven, it will have no beauty nor fruit; but will be an earthly, dark thing, a root? Yes, they understood that. Well, said he, now you know why I wish to check your animal appetites; your love of the body when that interferes with the mind's growth. It is right to love your body in a degree;—the body has its uses; but it is one thing to take care of your body and another to indulge it. The plant must have root enough to make it stand steady in the earth; but that is enough.

One day Alcott asked the children whether a conversation on "ideas," such as they had just finished, was more interesting than one on steam engines. Many said it was. A little boy exclaimed, "I never knew I had a mind till I came to this school; and a great many more burst out with the same idea." On another occasion Alcott said, "Some scholars came with their eyes closed; I mean the eyes of the . . ." "Mind!" all the children exclaimed, interrupting him.

How thoroughly Alcott believed in the theosophical idea that mind is the real plane of action is shown by a brief dialogue he inserted in his journal:

"What are you doing, friend, there in your retreat?"

"I am thinking."

"Idler! Callest that 'doing'? Nothing comes, or can by any means come, of that nothingness."

"Stay, friend. Thoughts are the parents of deeds. Now I am ambitious of begetting an illustrious family."

Again, speaking of a "new race" (the sixth?) to a gathering at Alcott House in London, 1843, Alcott said:

In order to attain the highest excellence of which man is capable, not only is a searching Reform necessary in the existing order of men and things, but the Generation of a new race of persons is demanded . . . the elements for a superior generation consist in an innocent fertile mind and a chaste healthful body, built up from the purest and most volatile productions of the uncontaminated earth, thus removing all hindrances to the immediate influx of Deity into the spiritual faculties and the corporeal organs.

From the *Record*:—excerpts from "lessons":

What is Insight? Insight is looking into ourselves, said one. . . . Insight, said Mr. Alcott, is the spirit seeing itself; and seeing the

> outward world in spirit. . . . The soul has two great faculties, Insight and Outsight. Some boys in this school have insight, and some outsight. . . .
>
> The Bible, said Mr. Alcott, is God in words. But the Bible is not the only Revelation of God. There are many Bibles, to those who think. Nature, the outward world, is a Bible. Its objects typify God's thoughts. The soul is a Bible.

"It was an additional gratification," says Miss Peabody, "to find that the most general and ideal conversations were remembered most distinctly. For it was most worthy of remark, in the review, that the most general views and the most ideal pictures were those which had seized most strongly on the minds of the younger children."

As Alcott once told his scholars, "It makes a great deal of difference in your characters, whether there are beautiful shapes in your minds or not; and, in using words, you should take great care to use such as may put shapes into the minds of others, which will mold them right." He used "delicate and gentle words" that would catch the mind up into thoughtful beauty, that would suffuse them in the splendour of Spirit, Shepard says, and "he left the whole matter of sex in the Shekinah glory of holiness." "The deliverance of the spirit is the first thing," said Alcott. "The physiological facts, sometimes referred to, are only a sign of the spiritual birth."

An integral part of his teaching was the use of emblems, symbols, metaphors, and parables, in which the children took great delight. Evidence of the ease with which they penetrated to the meaning of an "emblem"—Alcott's favorite designation for it—was never more abundant than when they gathered around their young teacher for a Conversation on the Gospels. Bible sayings, interpreted by their elders in the "gloomy New England tradition," were infused with life by Alcott and his scholars.

Jesus, the children loved and admired as the prime example of goodness, the embodiment of all the virtues, not a special creation or a unique individual. Rather, said Alcott, Jesus was a Man among men, a Great Teacher and a human being. "There is a strong expression of reverence, and natural sensibility to excellence, whenever he [Jesus] is referred to," says Miss Peabody. The children at the Temple School were encouraged to reverence the powers of Jesus but not to blindly worship his person. Alcott believed that Christianity should not be petrified into a stony system, but kept alive by use. Religious principles, in his view, were like those of mathematics, unchanging in themselves, but to be constantly applied to changing problems.

According to Alcott, the family, and, more particularly, the individuals in the family, are the only fertile ground for the seeds of true reform. And history has proved that *his* most successful teaching was done at home, among his four daughters. The "little women," as he named them, are irrefutable testimony to the wisdom of his method. He led them by natural steps to develop unselfish dispositions and to find and work out their inherent tendencies or gifts.

His star pupil was Louisa. "Jo" might have remained just a scribbler, but under her father's guidance, she became the author of *Little Women.* She was one of Bronson's few real friends. The relationship between father and daughter was a deep one, and it is safe to say that all she wrote was an expression of what she had been taught by her father. She was his gift to the America of his day. Through her he could speak to the younger generation, while in his journals he was writing for the future.

Louisa was born on Alcott's thirty-third birthday, November 29, 1832. Even a casual survey shows these two to be teeming with common powers, faculties, and traits. If Louisa was a "born storyteller," she was her father's daughter. A great asset to Alcott the teacher was his fertile imagination, and, as he wrote in his Journal:

> Time was when these fancies spontaneously pictured themselves in my mind, and the presence of a circle of children tempted them from off my lip. It was a great pleasure to weave the invisible world of persons and things into some story, and go masquerading with these mimes through the invisible world.
>
> Symbolical is all that meets the sense,
> One mighty Alphabet for Infant Minds;
> And we, in this low world, placed with our backs
> To bright Reality, that we may know
> With young unbounded ken, the substance
> From the shadow.

It may be surprising to us that few of the "dark moments" in Louisa's life were caused by poverty, and this also redounds to the credit of Bronson. We are told that the Alcotts never considered themselves really "poor." We know from the famous Christmas dinner story that opens *Little Women* that the family as a whole practiced Bronson's maxim that no one is ever too poor to give something away.

A corollary to this story is the "tale of the load of wood." Many versions of the tale, with varying degrees of "color," survive. Shepard's is perhaps the most reliable. It was a winter day at Fruitlands when Alcott gave the last of his winter's wood to a poor neighbor. Mrs. Alcott asked Bronson what *his* family would do for fuel.

Alcott is reported to have replied, and it would have been for him a most characteristic answer, that the Lord would provide. (Did he mean the *Law* would provide, since in his Journal he says, "I could not wait for the arithmetic of the matter"?) Sure enough, when "the last sticks were turning to a gray ash," a woodsman appeared with a wagonload of wood which he asked permission to leave, as a storm was coming on.

Just as Alcott was said by Emerson to have been "the most munificent man in Concord," it is reported of Louisa that she usually took up her pen to provide some necessity or comfort, not for herself, but for her family. The close relation between Bronson and Louisa continued to the end of the chapter. Louisa, without knowing of her father's death, died on the day of his funeral, March 6, 1888.

Bronson Alcott's genius as Man and Educator cannot be understood until we realize that he never advocated for others any plan or discipline unless he first had tried it on himself. It is certain that he never considered education to be solely an intellectual process, whereby information is imparted to the "pupil" by the "teacher." Alcott began by embodying his principles, then "taught" them. His sincerity reached his scholars, young and old, because his conviction never faltered. There was no uncertainty in him.

For Alcott, discipline was not a problem distinct from education. Quite the contrary. Discipline, he realized, is the beginning and the end of education, because self-control is the hall-mark of self-knowledge.

WORK OF THE ADEPTS

WHAT, THEN, ARE THE ADEPTS DOING? Not possibly could all their work be stated. But, for a part: (a) Assisting all good movements by acting on men from behind the scenes through mental influence. (b) Preparing as many men and women who are fit for it so that they may, in their next incarnation, appear in the world as active devotees to the good of the Human Family. (c) Spreading now, through impulses given in many places which must not be mentioned, a philosophy of life which will gradually affect the race mind, and in particular the active, conquering Western peoples, thus preparing the whole people to change and evolve yet further and further until evils disappear and better days and people re-appear.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

QUESTION: If Theosophy is the philosophy and religion of the most highly evolved beings, why do not the majority of Theosophists represent an extremely advanced combination of moral and mental qualities? A study of the Movement seems to show that those with the best mental capacities have fallen by the wayside, due to failings of pride and irresponsibility, while many of the most faithful have been lacking in the intellectual abilities which ought to be so useful in spreading Theosophy.

Answer: In this cycle of race evolution the progress of Theosophical endeavor must be worked out *within* the context of race characteristics, good and bad. When these immediate weaknesses are overcome by individuals, men and women who learn to combine their differing capacities in co-operative effort, then the foundation is established for the success of the Theosophical Movement. Thus W. Q. Judge often emphasized the idea that theosophists collectively form a cross-section of the race mind, save that each one has earned the karmic opportunity of participating directly in the Movement. Why should not this opportunity be earned by the simplest as well as the most complex minds?

But it is an opportunity heavy with responsibility. Under the pressure of occult duty, which inevitably falls upon those karmically connected with the direct line of the Movement, a period of inner trial ensues, during which both strengths and weaknesses are accentuated until a choice is made toward either "right" or "left" in this life. One who is "struck" by *his* mental ability in expounding the teachings, or one who is satisfied with merely devotional "feeling," will fall into the rut of uncreative complacency. Neither has assimilated the larger meaning of the philosophy to which he professes allegiance.

Because the intellectual are more active, they may come to grief sooner than those whose fault is chiefly involvement in the quality of Sattva—or Sattva modified by Tamas. But the latter will have their trials and failures, too, due, perhaps, to their lack of mental discipline. Failure to exercise Manas closes the mind to adequate understanding of the teachings, with the result that Theosophy, for such persons, becomes an elevated form of Psychism. They are unable to apply it correctly, even *personally,* and so will come to grief.

But the more spectacular failures—and the worst—have been among the most brilliantly intellectual. They reached a degree of intensity and complexity in their own natures which increased the

difficulties of the tests they faced. Others may seem for a time to progress serenely enough, at a purely psycho-devotional level, but, when their manasic faculties become more fully operative under Karma, the appropriate difficulties emerge.

Another factor bearing on this question is suggested by the phrase, "the economy of nature." The "strongest" and the "weakest" are often found side by side. The weak need the strong and the strong must fulfill their duty to the weak as their natural karmic obligation to the whole. There are few of the truly strong—few H. P. B.'s, few W. Q. J.'s and few R. C.'s—for among thousands of mortals, perhaps a single one genuinely strives for perfection, and yet his strength must carry the burden for many. This view is justified by the fact that Theosophists represent a cross-section of all humanity, for a similar situation exists in the world at large—a few great ones succor the weak in their hours of need. It may be that a Christ's dying on the Cross for the salvation of others is symbolic of the natural interdependence of all beings.

Let us remember H. P. B.'s position. She refused *no one* who sought her teachings, even though she easily perceived the almost certain failure of some who offered themselves as agents of Theosophical responsibility. Such failures, of both past and present, must be attracted again to a line of direct theosophical teaching—perhaps for a "last chance." They have earned, through *some* sincere effort, another opportunity to serve the Cause, to take fire again from the inspiration of a Great Teacher. Thus the occult meaning of "vicarious atonement" may be learned from Theosophical history.

UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE

If our purpose is to understand mankind and its yearnings, to grasp the essential reality of mankind, we must never set one man's truth against another's. All beliefs are demonstrably true. . . . But if we are to succeed in grasping what is essential in man, we must put aside the passions that divide us and that, once they are accepted, sow in the wind a whole Koran of unassailable verities and fanaticisms. . . . Truth is the language that expresses universality.

—EXUPERY.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

CLASSES over for the day, King repaired to the fraternity house and, entering his room, discovered Paul, his roommate, with a book open on his knee.

"I've been thinking over that idea of reincarnation," was Paul's greeting. "And I'd like to ask you a question. In reading this book by Julian Huxley, one of our eminent biologists, I came across this statement relating to the gene theory:

> At the instant of our conception, we are dealt the hand of cards with which we have, willy-nilly, to play the game of life; what hand we shall get at this inevitable moment is almost as much a matter of mere chance as it is each of the trivial times when we pick up the thirteen bits of paste-board from the green baize of the card table. That is one of the twentieth century discoveries of biology. . . .

"And then he says, 'With a realization of all that this implies, we can banish from human thought a host of fears and superstitions. No basis now remains for any doctrine of metempsychosis.' What would you say to that?"

"Let me ask you a question first," replied King as he sat down, glad that a natural opportunity had come to continue a discussion begun some weeks before. Paul had, if anything, a prejudice *toward* reincarnation, and after answering his questions, King had decided to let the idea grow of itself. Now he asked his friend, "How does Huxley get from genes to metempsychosis?"

"The idea," answered Paul, "is that since the genes in the chromosomes transmit character, we are predestined to certain habits of action, and therefore reincarnation is an unnecessary hypothesis."

"Doesn't it seem to you that Huxley is taking more for granted than do the scientists who specialize in genetic theory?" said King. "The gene itself has never been seen, as you know. Thomas Hunt Morgan, who spent twenty years in genetic research and received the Nobel prize for his work, said that as far as the scientists were concerned, the 'gene' was simply a postulate. Furthermore, it is not certain yet *that* the gene theory works, much less *how* it works. If you want to review the actual progress of gene research, in terms of practical philosophy, you might look up the Astral Body series in my volumes of THEOSOPHY—on the shelf over there—especially the fifth study, in the issue of May, 1940. There it shows that the larger problem of the geneticists is just who or what is the 'organizer' directing the activity of the genes and the chromosomes in the cells. Exact

processes are involved, they say, but they do not know what they are. On the admission of the biologists themselves, the gene theory is hardly ready yet to take its place as established."

"As a matter of fact," Paul said, "I'm not sure my own biology professor goes as far as Huxley. This professor has two children, and he told us that from watching them learn, he has convinced himself that there is more to a human being than body and brain."

"Of course the fact of physical heredity can hardly be disputed, any more than can the influence of environment, but these two facts do not by themselves form a satisfactory philosophy of life. They leave too much room for speculation and generalization. After all, we don't want to have *scientific* superstition. By the way, Paul, here's something I thought would interest you, so I copied it out. It's from Raymond Pearl, who was a biologist at Johns Hopkins University:

> In the field of human biology the admitted and crying need is for adequate synthesis of existing knowledge. It is an obvious truism that we know more in detail about the biology of man than about that of any other organism. . . . Every thoughtful person will admit that there is a kind of moral necessity to go forward in the attempt to get a better and more comprehensive understanding of the whole nature of man. . . . The bulk of scientific effort is, and always has been, directed toward analysis unaccompanied by synthesis. . . . But analysis at best leads only to knowledge; while synthesis may furnish wisdom. And mankind sorely needs more wisdom right here and now!

"Now that is just what Theosophy emphasizes—the basic laws that apply to the universe in general and in particular. People sometimes get the idea that theosophists dismiss all scientific investigations with a wave of the hand, because they are not 'spiritual.' Actually, Theosophy recognizes, or 'admits,' if you like, all the facts, and also the conclusions based on such facts, if they are not fictionized to fit a prejudice. Nor does Theosophy require that only circumstantial evidence be admitted, for that would be short-sighted: physical 'proof' or mere statistics can be misleading if read without understanding. Insofar as the theories of heredity and environmental influences are founded on clear evidence, they are in agreement with Theosophical teachings. The place of these two ideas in a complete philosophy of life is shown by Mr. Judge in the *Ocean of Theosophy,* where he wrote, 'How man has come to be the complex being that he is and why, are questions that neither Science nor Religion makes conclusive answer to.' That statement, written fifty years ago, is, unfortunately, still true today. It is significant that with this sentence he opens his consideration of reincarnation, and devotes three of his seventeen chapters to the subject."

"Look at chapter nine here." King picked up the *Ocean*. " 'Reincarnation is proved by the theory of heredity,' he says. Through heredity the soul is provided with the environment which will enable it to continue its evolution. We go to the family with which we have formed associations in the past. 'And as we as well as our parents were the makers and influencers of bodies, took part in and are responsible for states of society in which the development of physical body and brain was either retarded or helped on, debased or the contrary, so we are in this life responsible for the civilization in which we now appear.' This shows the connection of heredity with the basic law of action and reaction, because the conditions imposed on the soul by family heredity are the exact results of his own past actions. There is still another consideration, perhaps the most important of all, from one point of view: How do you yourself feel about the idea that we just follow the tendencies of our ancestors? If you were legislating for the universe, would you pass such a law?"

"I would not," declared Paul. "I don't know exactly what law I would pass, but I certainly would not fix it so that just because my grandfather had a bad temper, a weak will, or a poor brain, I have to have them too. Why that's nothing more than that the sins of the father shall be visited on the children to the third and fourth generation, and of all the injustices I ever heard of, that's the worst!"

"Since we're on the subject, did you ever trace that idea back? Your grandfather inherited from his parents and grandparents. Well and good, but where did they get their heredity? Don't forget there are, literally, all kinds of men and all sorts of natures and characters. Allowing for an infinite variety of combinations, you still need a source for each virtue and every vice, else how could they arise? Shall we fall back on the 'single pair' theory, and say that in the beginning there were Adam and Eve, and one was good and the other was *eve-il?*"

"Thank you, no," replied Paul. "I prefer reincarnation. You said the other time that reincarnation means we are responsible for our own lives and our fate. Only I don't know exactly how it's done. Suppose we work that out some more."

"First we reverse the idea that physical objects create metaphysical feelings and thoughts," began King. "Theosophy teaches that man makes his own destiny by his thoughts and actions. Nothing happens to him that is not due him as a result of causes he himself set up. Other people, circumstances, 'fate,' and so on, are not to be blamed. The science of Theosophy holds that every thought of ours coalesces with what might be called atomic 'lives.' In other words, thought

does not remain in some supernatural vacuum, but immediately takes to itself a vehicle—"

"A vehicle!" exclaimed Paul. "What on earth do you mean? Is it going to travel somewhere?"

"It sure is," said King. "All around the world, as a matter of fact. Just like a radio wave."

"I've never been called a radio station before, but go on. I don't mind."

"You can understand that no thought is isolated, then, because it is at once joined in motion with other thoughts of the same 'frequency.' To expand on a common phrase, we start a 'train of thought' going, and on its travels it picks up passengers and freight bound in the same direction. Its speed depends on the engine-power, which in this case is the force of will we put behind our thought. Its direction is determined by our motive, which faces one of two ways: either we are working toward the good of the whole or we are not. This illustrates the Theosophical maxim that *thought is the plane of action.* Common knowledge supports this, because we speak of a creative *mind,* never a creative heart or body or brain."

"I see," said Paul.

"Now we have the source of our 'fate,' or 'destiny,' " King went on. "Our 'train of thought' comes home and unloads its cargo of accumulated benefit or injury at our door. We sometimes think that others are the cause of our bad fortune, but they are only bringing back to us what we sent out. The same goes for our 'good luck' too, of course."

"I should think the sensible thing to do would be to find out which thoughts will bring which results, and then we could control our fate. Or, isn't that possible?" Paul asked.

"In Theosophy, that is the real purpose of life and evolution," King responded. "And Theosophy teaches that there are highly developed beings, once men like us, who now understand the exact relations and therefore control not only their own powers, but the powers or forces of nature as well."

"How did they do it?"

"They have told us that the very first step is 'in the cheerful performance of duty,' and, they say, 'especially the *little* duties of life,' " King said. "Every day we are making 'environment' and 'heredity' for ourselves, just as we have been doing during all the many lives we have spent here on earth." He picked up the book he had been reading that morning. "The *Friendly Philosopher* may give us a

clue. What do you think of this?" Paul read from the "Homely Hints":

> True strength lies *within* and can only be aroused and used by ceasing to think anything in particular of an external nature is *necessary* for us, in the ordinary acceptation of the word. We have our place and our duty to fulfill and perform; externals are our temporary opportunities, and we shall be wise if we use these rightly.

"When we blame 'heredity' or 'environment' for our characters, we are assigning the cause to an effect," said King. "Family heredity does not make the individual what he is. The individual, in co-operation with other individuals, *creates* a family, a family line, or a family 'heredity.' Environment itself has no effect on us. Nothing outside us can touch us, really. It is when we take the outside inside—into our mind or our feelings—that we become concerned with it and in it. Mr. Crosbie says we do not need 'externals,' and this indicates what our true position is to be. There is no need to continue regarding ourselves as irrevocably 'conditioned.' We can become conscious directors, to whom life's 'knocks' are only opportunities."

A Reminiscence of AE

One evening it was about the intuitions he had had of his own incarnations that he talked. "They tell me that my recollections and visions are ancestral memories—a mere phrase. I talked to Julian Huxley about it once. You tell me, I said, that a man cannot transmit musical knowledge, or a language he has mastered, or a craft, to his children? No, he said, you may transmit a tendency, but everything has to be learnt afresh. And yet you tell me, I said, that when I get a glimpse of strange cities and buildings I have never seen, vivid and alive in every detail, the figures in the streets, the sharp shadows, it has nothing to do with me, but is a memory of some hypothetical ancestor of mine who may have gone on the Crusades? Huxley didn't know what to say. He told me he had sat up all night once trying to find a flaw in one of my arguments, and had to give up!"

—Constance Sitwell.

PAN AND PANTHEISM

THE restitution of borrowed robes, a vital part of theosophic work, extends beyond justice simply to human kind. Mythologic gods had to be vindicated by H. P. Blavatsky along with the great men of the past, for since pagan days history has been interwoven with distorted Christian theories about the beliefs of the ancients, and only as these misconceptions are corrected can we hope to understand the religious ideas of the forefathers of our race.

H. P. Blavatsky reveals in a sentence how the Greek nature-god, Pan, was treated during the rise of Churchianity: "History," she wrote, "will not recognize him, while theology makes of him the devil." (*S. D.* II, 581.) In doing this Christian theology was following its time-honored policy of stealing and perverting doctrines that could not be ignored and forgotten. What easier than to turn every pagan deity into a devil!

Pan, however, was not destined to become any common demon. Theology, having invented a personal God, created Satan as a matter of necessity. Having exchanged philosophical and logical Pantheism for the "merciful father in Heaven," it was clear that some explanation for human suffering must be found. A screen was needed, a scapegoat to explain the cruelty, blunders and too evident injustices perpetrated by "Him" for whom absolute perfection, mercy, and goodness were claimed.

This was the first karmic effect of exchanging Pantheism for a personal god. Pan presented a model to the theologians. They placed horns on their devil, for, we learn,

> The Devil had no horns before the fourth century of the Christian era. It is purely Patristic invention arising from their desire to connect the god Pan, and the pagan Fauns and Satyrs, with their Satanic legend. The demons of Heathendom were as hornless and as tailless as the Archangel Michael himself in the imaginations of his worshippers. The "horns" were, in pagan symbolism, an emblem of divine power and creation, and of fertility in nature. Hence the ram's horns of Ammon, of Bacchus, and of Moses on ancient medals, and the cow's horns of Isis and Diana, etc., etc., and of the Lord God of the Prophets of Israel himself (THEOSOPHY V, 157).

"Two-horned" is the epithet given in Asia to those conquerors who subdued the world from East to West (See *S. D.* II, 398).

When the heavenly host, says a legend known since the days of Tiberias, told the shepherds at Bethlehem of the birth of Christ, a deep groan was heard through all the isles of Greece. "The great

Pan is dead!" wailed the mysterious voice over the Ionian Sea, and upon hearing it Tiberias and the pagan world were plunged into despair, while the Nazarenes rejoiced and attributed Pan's death to the birth of their new "God." Because of Pan's death all the royalty of Olympus were dethroned and sent forth wandering in cold and darkness. H. P. Blavatsky said of the grief of the pagans and the joy of the Nazarenes: "Fools, both, who little suspected that Pan—the 'All Nature'—could not die."

The word Pan means "all"—an ever-present reminder of his primeval symbolism, for Pan once represented Absolute Nature. But this was in a time that far preceded our historical epoch, taking us back to the days of the first Atlanteans:

> The first Atlantean races, born on the Lemurian Continent, separated from their earliest tribes into the righteous and the unrighteous; into those who worshipped the one unseen Spirit of Nature, the ray of which man feels within himself—or the Pantheists, and those who offered fanatical worship to the Spirits of the Earth (*S. D.* II, 273).
>
> From the early ages of the Fourth Race, when Spirit alone was worshipped and the mystery was made manifest, down to the last palmy days of Grecian art at the dawn of Christianity—the Hellenes alone had dared to raise publicly an altar to the UNKNOWN GOD (I, 327).

This unknown God (eternal, uncreate Nature, the root of All) was known as Pan. His worship was universal. Grecian myth relates Pan to that ancient clock of the universe, the Zodiac. Fable tells how he changed himself into a goat at the approach of Typhon and left his impress on the sidereal records, a sight for future centuries. Dr. Strath Gordon, who founded the Atlantean Research Society in 1906, showed that the Mayas of Central America called their principal city Panamaya, named for the constellation of Capricornus, the goat, or Pan. At the winter solstice, about December 21st, the sun enters the sign of Capricornus, which is composed of twenty-eight stars in the form of a goat.

When history catches its first glimpse of Pan, he has already tumbled to the level of a rural nature-god, the god of shepherds, huntsmen, peasants and forest-dwellers. He is often figured in connection with aquatic birds, geese especially. The swan and goose are sometimes called "A-hamsa," which means the one All, the I am That I am, the three-in-one Self.

Surrounded by birds, Pan sits by the waters of life and plucks reeds from the water. He invented the Pandean pipes; no nymph who heard their sound could resist the fascination of the great Pan,

his grotesque appearance notwithstanding. This is the "*godling* of the fields," whom Homer makes the son of Hermes and Dryope, the wood nymph. He is a rural god, yet "his seven-piped flute, the emblem of the seven forces of nature, of the seven planets, the seven musical notes, of all the septenary harmony, in short, shows well his primordial character."

As centuries passed, selfish priestcraft quenched the flame of the "living fire" (Akasa), that formerly sprang from the altars of Pan. Greedy priests who lived upon popular superstition distorted Pan into a god of *their own making,* a fiction, the horned monster with the legs of a goat.

Since, as we have seen, Pan was misunderstood by many pagans, as well as by the Christians, it is but natural that Pan*theism* is also misunderstood. As H. P. B. wrote in *The Key to Theosophy* (63-4):

> The term "Pantheism" is again one of the many abused terms, whose real and primitive meaning has been distorted by blind prejudice and a one-sided view of it. If you accept the Christian etymology of this compound word, and form it of . . . , "all," and . . . , "god," and then imagine and teach that this means that every stone and every tree in Nature is a God or the ONE God, then, of course, you will be right, and make of Pantheists fetish-worshippers, in addition to their legitimate name. But you will hardly be as successful if you etymologise the word Pantheism esoterically, and as we do. . . . Nature or Pan is . . . the personified sum and order of known causes and effects; the total of all finite agencies and forces, as utterly disconnected from an intelligent Creator or Creators.

The question of whether or not pantheists are fetish worshippers hinges on the definition of Nature. H. P. B. has written:

> Between Pantheism and Fetishism, we have been repeatedly told, there is but an insignificant step. Plato was a Monotheist, it is asserted. In one sense, he was that, most assuredly; but his Monotheism never led him to the worship of one *personal* God, but to that of a Universal Principle and to the fundamental idea that the absolutely immutable or unchangeable Existence alone, really *is,* all the finite existences and change being only appearance, *i. e.,* Maya (THEOSOPHY V, 167).

Universal Principle, unchangeable Existence—these are words to be remembered; for when Pantheists make Pan or Nature identical with DEITY, the absolute, abstract Nature is meant, not the world of our senses, a world of flitting shadows and finite unrealities. The hymn-makers call the visible sky or heaven, God's Throne, our earth of mud, His footstool. But the deity of the true pantheist is in neither a paradise, a particular building nor a mountain; IT is everywhere, pervading every atom of the visible and invisible worlds.

Theosophists believe in a Universal Divine Principle, the root of ALL, from which all proceeds, and within which all shall be absorbed at the end of the great cycle of evolution. This is the old, old claim of Pantheism.

Now, perhaps, it is clear what H. P. Blavatsky meant when she spoke of "our Pantheism . . . for real Theosophy *is that*"; and again, "the Deity can only be seen and conceived of in objective nature—pure pantheism."

What of the future? "Pantheism," H. P. B. has said, ". . . *may* be 'physically *rediscovered*'." It was known, seen, and felt by the whole of antiquity. Pantheism manifests itself in the vast expanse of the starry heavens, in the breathing of the seas and oceans and the quiver of life of the smallest blade of grass." (*S. D.* I, 533.) Immortal Pan—the "All-Nature"—cannot die. Because he lies sleeping, men have for long centuries thought the "great Pan is dead,"—

> But people are greatly mistaken in this; neither nature nor any of her Forces can ever die. A few of these may be left unused, and being forgotten lie dormant for long centuries. But no sooner are the proper conditions furnished than they awake, to act again with tenfold power. (*Theosophical Glossary,* "Pan.")

World-Symbolism

All the world-mountains and mundane eggs, the mundane trees, and the mundane snakes and pillars, may be shown to embody scientifically demonstrated truths of natural philosophy. All of these mountains contain, with very trifling variations, the allegorically-expressed description of primal cosmogony; the mundane trees, that of subsequent evolution of spirit and matter; the mundane snakes and pillars, symbolical memorials of the various attributes of this double evolution in its endless correlation of cosmic forces. Within the mysterious recesses of the mountain—the matrix of the universe—the gods (powers) prepare the atomic germs of organic life, and at the same time the life-drink, which, when tasted, awakens in man-matter the man-*spirit*. From the poetry of abstract conception, these mundane myths gradually passed into the concrete images of cosmic symbols, as archaeology now finds them.

—H. P. Blavatsky.

ON THE LOOKOUT

No Blue-Prints For Moral Order

Dr. Evan W. Thomas, assistant professor of Medicine at the New York University College of Medicine, writing on ways and means to achieve permanent peace, offers the following discussion of "The Meaning of Organization," which should be of particular interest to theosophists who have adopted the "Declaration" of the U. L. T.:

> Well meaning materialists and idealists have long sought to save mankind by impressive blue-prints of a planned society. On the whole, the result of their political machinations and choice of methods has pushed society still farther towards the goal of a regimented and static civilization. Organization *per se* seeks short cuts and immediate results. Therefore, it demands authoritative leadership and uniformity of action. Because it recognizes success only in terms of power it imposes its will by coërcion and organized violence. Once successful, it invariably seeks to become an end in itself. This is the lesson of totalitarianism, whether communist, fascist or the absolutism of a Holy Roman Empire.

Ends, Means, and Organization

> As long as man seeks salvation through the search for bread alone, or power alone, organization will inevitably require increasing coërcion and regimentation. Regardless of the nature of the ideals we claim to seek, whenever men think primarily in terms of organization, any means will be accepted which promotes the power of organization. It is a mistake to believe that the end does not justify the means, provided we really attain the end sought. Both logic and history prove that good ends are not achieved by evil methods. To realize this, however, we must never confuse organization with ends. If we do, we inevitably accept any means which strengthens the organization. In the light of history none can deny the effectiveness of coërcion, misrepresentation and even violence in promoting the power of organization. They are the natural and logical methods of organized power and, if power is our goal, the end vindicates them. Once we realize, however, that organization is not and never can be the means to a more abundant life, apart from the struggle for bread alone, our first loyalty belongs elsewhere. Justice is not achieved through injustice, nor is the truth promoted by lies. Means must be consistent with the ends sought. The confusing element in the age-old controversy about means and ends lies in organization. If we kept our eyes less on the organization and more on the actual conditions of life, we would not be so blind about the relationship of ends

and means. A communist who once attempted to justify the acknowledged misrepresentation of his party propaganda on the grounds that it led to ultimate truth was confusing the demands of organized power with ultimate truth. Misrepresentation might well have served the interests of communist organization; it certainly did not serve the truth.

Organizations Are Amoral

To be of service to life, organization must always be accepted as a means and never as an end. In other words, the same principles of honesty and fair dealing must be accepted by organization as by individuals. If this is done, we will never confuse organization with life, and we will always put first things first. Liberal education has failed utterly to make this distinction with the result that many college professors and preachers confuse organizational ideals with morality. Morals are concerned with methods and even undergraduates are beginning to be aware of the contradiction involved in fighting evil with evil. If morality is to mean anything, individuals are responsible for their actions and individuals alone can make organization respect moral values. Left to its own devices organization itself has no use for morality except as ideals can be used to fool the people it wishes to control. Neither Church nor State has refrained from using immoral methods for the sake of organization gains. The only restraining factors have been the faith and loyalty of individuals who constantly challenge such methods and refuse to accept organization as an end in itself.

What Price "Efficiency"?

In the process of the struggle for complete mastery, organization can be extraordinarily dynamic. Both communism and nazism are instances of this. When organization finally succeeds, however, human values are crushed and there is nothing left but a machine-like efficiency with no other purpose than its own perpetuation. This is not salvation but death. It marks the end of the struggle which alone can give meaning to freedom and life itself.

Absolute power and efficiency of organization are mighty assets in war, which destroys life, but they can never make men creative or good. No greater folly was ever perpetrated than the idea that men can be saved by the efforts of others or by the decrees of government. War results largely from the insatiable desire to achieve some new organized utopia through which man is saved in spite of himself. The logic of all such efforts, however idealistic in purpose, results only in the enslavement of all.

THE "ESCAPE" APPEAL

Dr. Thomas is aware of the psychological appeal of "organization," warning:

> We can become so enamored of our particular theories about an ideal society that our individual responsibility to the values which create the good life becomes submerged in the responsibilities demanded by organization. The escape which this offers is a constant temptation. It is far easier to work for ideals through an organized effort to make others good than it is to remain true to principles of action which are demanded by morality.

The modern tendency to rely on organization—for "doing good," as through the Community Chest; for repressing social injustice, as by the growing body of restrictive laws; for achieving security, as promised by the Townsend Plan—while doubtless of complex origins, is certainly to be explained in part by the unwillingness of individuals to assume personal responsibility. Subconscious desires to be free of private obligation are at the root of human susceptibility to organizational propaganda. Also, to "belong" to an organization is often a prop to egotism for those who lack inner resources of self-respect.

FREEDOM, POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE

The movement to organization has reached massive proportions in Europe. The regimented societies of the continent illustrate what happens when the problems of the individual become so forbidding that he welcomes the "protection" of the totalitarian scheme. Erich Fromm, a sociologist, regards the rise of fascism in Europe as an "Escape from Freedom." A writer in the *Saturday Review of Literature* (Aug. 30, 1941) summarizes Fromm's recent book of this title:

> The most alarming portent in the world today [is] the rejection by free men of their freedom in favor of voluntary slavery. . . . Fromm finds that the growth of human freedom has been attended by grave psychological dangers, since the loosing of the primary ties which bound men to nature and to one another in unself-conscious unity, has too often left all but the most favored individuals feeling helpless and alone, a prey to hostile and unintelligible forces and to dark, irrational fears. Many of the institutions and ideologies which men have constructed in their slow, reluctant progress towards freedom can be understood as attempts on the part of the newly freed to overcome this feeling of moral isolation. The trouble seems to be that man's negative freedom, his freedom from bondage and control, has usually increased faster than his positive freedom, his freedom to

mold and dominate his environment, and the same insecurity and anxiety has resulted as occurs in children who, after they realize their separateness from their parents, find themselves thwarted by them. This sense of insecurity and isolation has been particularly characteristic, Fromm believes, of the middle class ever since the rise of capitalism.

Enslaved By Desire

The nihilistic revolution that has resulted from the misuse of freedom by western civilization was clearly anticipated and warned against by the Agents of the Theosophical Movement. Mme. Blavatsky wrote in 1890:

> This is the age which, although proclaimed as one of physical and moral freedom, is in truth the age of the most ferocious moral and mental slavery, the like of which was never known before. Slavery to State and *men* has disappeared only to make room for slavery to *things* and *Self,* to one's own vices and idiotic customs and ways. Rapid civilization, adapted to the needs of the higher and middle classes, has doomed by contrast to only greater wretchedness the starving masses. (Theosophy iii, 453.)

In *Echoes from the Orient,* W. Q. Judge said:

> For the civilization of today, and especially of the United States, is an attempt to accentuate and glorify the individual . . . the Mahatmas who guard the truth through the ages while nations are decaying, assert that the reaction is sure to come in a relapse into the worst forms of anarchy (p. 5).

Cycle of "Unrest"

Mr. Judge wrote elsewhere:

> We are here in a new race and a new cycle, and persons who know say that a cycle is going to end in a few years and a new one begin, and that that ending and beginning will be accompanied by convulsions of society and of nature. We can all almost see it coming. . . . The people will rise. For what, who can tell? The statesman who can see *for what* the uprising will be might take the measures to counter-act. But all your measures cannot turn back the iron will of fate. . . . Let those who can hear the whispers, and the noise of gathering clouds, of the future, take notice; let them read, if they know how, the physiognomy of the United States, whereon the mighty hand of nature has traced the furrows to indicate the character of the moral storms that will pursue their course no matter what the legislation may be. But enough. Theosophists can go on unmoved, for they know that as Krishna said to Arjuna, these bodies are not the real man, and that "no one has ever been non-existent nor shall any of us ever cease to exist." (Theosophy xxx, 164; iii, 67.)

"ILL FARES THE LAND"

The "Turkish Effendi" warned in 1880:

> In the degree in which the State depends for its political, commercial, and social well-being and prosperity, not upon a moral but a mechanical basis, is its foundation perilous. When the lifeblood of a nation is its wealth, and the existence of that wealth depends upon the regularity with which railroads and telegraphs perform their function, it is in the power of a few skilled artisans, by means of combined operation, to strangle it. . . . Combinations among the working classes are now rendered practicable . . . which formerly were impossible; and the facilities, which exist for secret conspiracy, have turned Europe into a slumbering volcano, an eruption of which is rapidly approaching.
>
> Thus it is that the laws of retribution run their course, and that the injuries that Anti-Christendom has inflicted upon the more primitive and simple races of the world, which, under the pretext of civilizing them, it has explored to its own profit—will be amply avenged. THEOSOPHY III, 65.)

HUNDRED-YEAR CYCLE

As a concrete example of the principles and prophecies enunciated in the foregoing, the historical events in connection with the conquest of Hongkong, as well as those signalizing its loss, may be recalled. Hongkong became a British possession exactly one hundred years ago, ceded "in perpetuity" according to the Treaty of Nangking, which was signed by the defeated Chinese at the close of the Opium War. Justin McCarthy, the English historian, explains the motive for this conflict:

> Reduced to plain words, the principle for which we fought in the China War was the right of Great Britain to force a peculiar trade [a market for opium] upon a foreign people in spite of the protestations of the Government and all such public opinion as there was of the nation. Of course this was not the avowed motive of the war. Not often in history is the real and inspiring motive of a war proclaimed in so many words by those who carry it on. Not often, indeed, is it seen, naked and avowed, even in the minds of its promoters themselves. . . . All traffic in opium was strictly forbidden by the governments and laws of China; yet our English traders carried on a brisk and profitable trade in the forbidden article. . . . (*A History of Our Times,* Vol. I, Chapt. 8.)

When China attempted to prevent the spread of the opium habit among her people, demanding forfeiture of a large quantity of the drug, war broke out. Speaking of his own government, Mr. Mc-

Carthy observes: "In dealing with China the ministry never seems to have thought the right or wrong of the question a matter worthy of any consideration." And to the English people in general (to their credit, if only negatively), "it seemed as if the safety of English subjects and the honor of England were compromised in some way by the high-handed proceedings of the Chinese government."

"England of the Orient"

While the United States refused to have anything to do with Britain's "nefarious enterprise," as Caleb Cushing called the Opium War, two years later (in 1844) America concluded its first treaty with China, obtaining concessions equal to those of the British, excluding, however, territorial privileges. Thus the opium war brought us trade advantages, although the shame of the conquest was England's! During these years of expanding American "empire," the phrase, "Manifest Destiny," came into popularity in Washington. Nine years later, in 1853, Commodore Perry's warships "opened up" Japan. Perry seized several islands (later relinquished) close to Japan, and he wanted to "annex" Formosa, but Washington, fortunately, disapproved. America's first diplomatic representative to Japan was Townsend Harris, who introduced the "big brother" school of thought with regard to the relation of the United States to the Japanese. Warning Japan against the threat of Britain's naval power, and her "opium salesmen," he offered America's tutelage in western ways and methods. "If you accept my proposals," Harris promised, "Japan will become the England of the Orient."

Japan's "New Weapon"

The sordid tale of Japan's westernization is well known. She soon learned the lesson of occidental commerce, industry, and finally, of militarism and naval power. The Japanese, as H. P. B. said in 1889, were "mad and crazy to acquire Western civilization." After defeating China in 1894-5, Japan was surprised to find European powers growing "respectful" in their attitude. This respect increased still more following the Japanese victory over Russia in 1905. But with every successful imitation of the "fighting and trading West," the Japanese rulers lost more and more their moral perspective. Carl Crow, writing in the *Survey Graphic* for August, 1940, has characterized the Japanese invasion of China: "An army under tight discipline, literate, civilized in all the superficials, using the most modern technical developments, is resorting to the bestial

methods of savages." In a more recent article, he calls "dope" Japan's new weapon. He presents damning evidence from the files of the League of Nations and the Institute of Pacific Relations, showing that Japan is systematically attempting to enslave still more of the Chinese people to the drug habit. Of this "opium war," even more revolting than that of a century ago, he writes:

> Advance guards of dope peddlers debauch populations, particularly young men of fighting age, to pave the way for army victories. Special agents plot to make addicts of Chinese who are or might become dangerous to the conquerors. Battalions of dope peddlers come in with the troops, to keep the people enslaved—and to make money. And the drug traffic helps finance the Japanese army. (*Reader's Digest,* March, 1940.)

THE SAME OBJECTIVE?

But while this infamous program of debauchery was being carried out, the British Ambassador at Tokyo, Sir Robert Leslie Craigie—on March 28, 1940—delivered himself of the following sentiments at a meeting of the Japan-British Society:

> Japan and Great Britain are two maritime Powers on the fringe of continents and vitally concerned with events on those Continents. Methods may in some cases differ, but both countries are ultimately striving for the same objective, namely, lasting peace and the preservation of our institutions from extraneous subversive influences. It is surely not beyond the powers of constructive statesmanship to bring the aims of the national policies into full harmony. (*Foreign Policy Reports,* July 1, 1940.)

1000 TO 7

Over against the curious morality of this declaration, we may set a paragraph by an Australian journalist, included by C. Hartley Grattan in his recent book, *Introducing Australia.* Australia, be it remembered, is determined to "stay white," and has "the most ruthlessly maintained color bar in the world." The Australian writer says to his countrymen:

> Just look around you. There are 7,000,000 of us occupying the world's fifth continent. Next door is the most crowded, poverty-stricken, restless, hungry corner of the globe. China, India, Japan—a thousand million people, half the world's population, living on the world's lowest standard of living, grown envious of Occidental habits, appetites and privileges. Are they waiting for something? Have they been waiting for a long time?

"Without Distinction"

There are two fitting commentaries to all this, which may be expressed in the words of H. P. Blavatsky. She wrote:

> One day the millions of China and Mongolia, heathen and Musselman, furnished with every murderous weapon invented by civilization, and forced on the *Celestial* of the East, by the *infernal* spirit of trade and love of lucre of the West, drilled, moreover, to perfection by Christian manslayers—will pour into and invade decaying Europe like an irrespressible torrent (Theosophy xxviii, 538).

> It is not violence that can ever insure bread and comfort for all; nor is the kingdom of peace and love, of mutual help and charity and "food for all," to be conquered by a cold, reasoning diplomatic policy. It is only by the close brotherly union of men's inner Selves, of soul-solidarity, of the growth and development of that feeling which makes one suffer when one thinks of the sufferings of others, that the reign of Justice and equality for all can ever be inaugurated. This is the first of the three fundamental objects for which the Theosophical Society was established, and called the "Universal Brotherhood of Man," without distinction of *race, color or creed.*" (Theosophy xxx, 295.)

Footnote On Brain-Mind

The New York *Times* science editor recently asserted that thinking is impossible without brains. (*Times,* Jan. 11, see June Lookout). Dr. Ralph Bingham Cloward, neuro-surgeon who treated Pearl Harbor victims, has another story, told in the *Journal* of the American Medical Association for Jan. 24:

> Few of the patients with penetrating wounds of the brain were brought to the receiving station in an unconscious state. The majority of them had not even been unconscious but were able to recall everything that had transpired from the time they were hit until they arrived at the hospital. This was a most surprising fact to the doctors who saw these cases. Patients with large gaping wounds in the frontal areas with considerable quantities of cerebral tissue oozing from the wounds were found to be conscious, cooperative, rational and able to give their identification.

Dr. Cloward shows that other bodily conditions said to cause or contribute to loss of consciousness, namely, "loss of blood, damage to brain substance itself and cerebral anemia," were present in these patients, *and yet the conscious action of the individual was not impaired.*

PSYCHIC GEYSER

"Interest in hypnotism spouts up, geyserlike, in wartime," begins J. B. Griswold under the title, "Can You Be Hypnotized?" in the May *American Magazine*. Discussing "this powerful, spooky, misunderstood force," Mr. Griswold quotes a "noted psychologist": "We don't know yet just *what* hypnotism can do." The psychoanalyst, Dr. A. A. Brill of New York, "has made alcoholics stop drinking for a few weeks and has tried hypnotism in psychoanalysis, but he says that anything that can be done with hypnotism can be done better with some other method." Also, "Robert W. White, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology at Harvard, told me of a widely known singer who, in the midst of a successful career, suddenly acquired stage fright at every performance. After four hypnotic treatments it vanished. Dr. White hypnotized the musician 25 times in 20 weeks and the stage fright seemed to be cured. However, after a year, it is returning and the singer has lost faith in hypnotism." (The questionable practice of so-called "therapeutic" hypnotism, especially auto-hypnosis, was reviewed in Lookout for December, 1941.)

DIAMONDS IN THE ROUGH

The writer's own conclusion follows:

> From unimpeachable sources I learned of amazing results in hypnotic therapeutics, and I am convinced today that this weird, intangible force is being kicked around like a shabby-looking necklace on the sidewalk. Those who guess it is made of glass baubles may learn that they are kicking diamonds and emeralds.

The careful student may read behind Mr. Griswold's bizarre descriptions the fact that the writer's "unimpeachable sources" must have been vague about the *cause,* however enthusiastic they might have been about the result, of hypnotic therapy. Those who "guess," Mr. Griswold and the "noted psychologist" included, may learn that, as the diamond is brittle as well as hard, it behooves those who know its value to take care lest it fall out of its proper setting. The place in the anciently universal Science of Life reserved for the force of hypnotism may be discovered by reflection on the objects of the present Theosophical Movement. These stress first the universal,—brotherliness, and then the particulars,—the laws and powers that man may use in the service of his fellows.

Hypnotism For the Masses

The article highlights the possible new field for hypnotic experiments—the radio audience. Not that hypnotizing radio listeners is in itself a novelty, as dramatically proved by a certain planetary visitation a few years ago. (See also "Hypnotic Propaganda," Lookout, February, 1939, and Lookout for May, 1939, on "absent treatment" by hypnosis via the radio.) But if the practice were to be frankly advertised, something new would be added, to use a current idiom. As related in the *American:*

> Howard Klein, a stage performer, appeared to observers to hypnotize more than half of a group of volunteers in a closed room out of his sight. His voice carried to them over a loud-speaker but did not go on the air. The success of this experiment inspired a plan for Klein to try to hypnotize an entire radio audience, but it was stopped by horrified executives who pointed out that if Klein hypnotized 100,000 listeners, probably 10,000 would sue for damages . . . almost every crime committed while Klein was on the air would be blamed on him.

Those aware of the implications of such wanton use of a powerful *and* misunderstood force may wish to elevate the profit motive to the status of a "saving grace," temporarily, at least.

"Black Magic in Science"

Clearly, this "new development" was to be expected, along with other forms of modern sorcery. H. P. B. wrote:

> Thus experiments in "suggestion" by persons ignorant of the occult laws, are the most dangerous of pastimes. The action and reaction of ideas on the *inner lower* "Ego," has never been studied so far, because that Ego itself is *terra incognita* (even when not denied) to the men of science. Moreover, such performances before a promiscuous public are a danger in themselves. Men of undeniable scientific education who experiment on Hypnotism in public, lend thereby the sanction of their names to such performances. And then every unworthy speculator acute enough to understand the process may, by developing by practice and perseverance the same force in himself, apply it to his own selfish, often criminal, ends. *Result on Karmic lines:* every Hypnotist, every man of Science, however well-meaning and honorable, once he has allowed himself to become the unconscious instructor of one who learns but to abuse the sacred science, becomes, of course, morally the confederate of every crime committed by this means. (Theosophy III, 294.)

VOLUNTARY SUBJECTS

The tell-tale word in this report of hypnotic experiments is "volunteers." For unless the group had voluntarily subjected itself, the experiment would have failed. However, an important qualification is expressed by Mr. Griswold: "While it is true that, the first time, no one can be hypnotized against his will—that means, if he knows what's going on." In this instance Mr. Griswold knows whereof he speaks, for he reports that he himself successfully fought the suggestions of the hypnotist.

Of the hypnotic process *per se,* we are merely told:

> In the hypnotic state the unconscious mind is mysteriously released, and the mind and body act freely upon almost any suggestion.
>
> Millions have seen vaudeville hypnotic exhibitions and have noticed that obviously hypnotists do something that temporarily weakens will powers. Under such sponsorship hypnotism has acquired a bad name. There is some foundation for our prejudice, although any real injury through hypnotism is practically unknown.

Confronted with what may be called a "vocabulary of the mysterious," the innocent bystander may be allowed a mild skepticism about the harmlessness of hypnotism. Psychic injuries are more deep-seated and less easily recognized than ordinarily observable effects.

"I COULD IF I WOULD"

Mr. Griswold illustrates the passivity induced: After coming out of a trance, one hypnotic subject discovered his hand waving in the air without his willing it to. When the operator stopped the motion, the subject's comment was: "I felt that I could stop it if I tried, but somehow I didn't want to try." (For a neurologist's definition of the paralysis of the will involved in hypnotism, see THEOSOPHY XXV, 285.)

"ONE OF ITS DANGERS"

We are warned in passing:

> Unlike the ability to be hypnotized, the power to hypnotize can be acquired by almost anyone who carefully notes a hypnotist in action and then practices on friends. That's one of its dangers. You don't have to have piercing eyes, nor learn magic words, nor how to wave your hands.

The danger of hypnotism, it would seem, is that it enables the practitioner to win people and influence friends.

The fact of psychical powers latent in man is steadily percolating through the race mind, but the Theosophical Teachers warn that for

nan's own protection he should realize that these powers, like all ›thers, are capable of misuse, as of use. Ignorance of this rule does ıot nullify the lawful consequences of its infraction.

THE CASE AGAINST HYPNOTISM

"With all the evidence at hand (!) why is hypnotism being kicked round?" asks Mr. Griswold rhetorically:

> First, there is the opposition of well-qualified medical men such as Dr. Brill, who have conscientiously experimented with hypnotism and who firmly believe it isn't worth using, and who say that "radical" psychologists over-estimate its practical value. Second, the opposition of medical men who haven't tried hypnotism, but who realize that if they did they'd be branded as quacks and witch-doctors.
>
> Unprejudiced psychologists say that men like Dr. Brill may be right, but that nobody is sure. Hypnotism has proved itself in the psychological laboratory, but no widespread and intensive investigation has been made of its practical uses.

Can it be that "all the evidence" is not at hand? And how, by the vay, could hypnotism prove itself in the psychological laboratory, nd still leave doubts as to its practical uses?

POPULAR "PREJUDICE"?

Dr. G. H. Estabrooks, Professor of Psychology at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., told the *American* writer:

> There is no doubt that hypnotism may be of great aid in curing many types of human diseases. At present, however, *it has practically no real value in America, because of popular prejudice,* which sees it as something closely allied to *black magic.* (Italics ours.)

Psychology professors may prefer to call it prejudice, but theosohists see in it the memory of Atlantean days, and work to make nanifest the word of the Teacher: "Arise, then, O Atlanteans, and epair the mischief done so long ago!" Mr. Griswold concludes:

> So, until we destroy ignorance, there will lie idle a force that might be used for enormous good. But there is hope for enlightenment. The younger generation is coming out of colleges with no prejudice against hypnotism and with a real curiosity as to its practical possibilities. Our grandsons may take hypnotic treatment and become honor students, and our granddaughters may use it to make themselves actually enjoy a weight-reducing diet. Remember, you who believe hypnotism is witchcraft, your forefathers thought tomatoes were poison.

We humbly submit that enlarging brains and reducing bodies can ıardly be an "enormous good," but we also "hope for enlighten-

ment," especially with regard to the moral possibilities of hypnotism And, in taking leave of Mr. Griswold, we would ask *him* to remem ber for future reference, that those who do not believe hypnotism may be witchcraft, may find that this "tomato" *is* poison.

"PIONEER—NOT CHARLATAN"

Last year Lookout noted a change for the better in the scientif view of Paracelsus (THEOSOPHY XXIX, 378). With the present em phasis on ESP and hypnotism, it is perhaps natural that another c calumniated reputation should now be "glorified"—Franz Anto Mesmer. In a recent *Pharmacal Advance* (1941, No. 156), D Frederick A. Weiss writes on "Mesmer—Pioneer, not Charlatan'

> On May 14th, 1784, Lafayette wrote in a letter to Washington from Paris: "A doctor, called Mesmer, having made the greatest discovery upon animal magnetism, has instructed scholars, among whom your humble servant is called one of the most enthusiastic . . . and before I go, I will get leave to let you into the secret of Mesmer, which you may depend upon, is a grand philosophical discovery." . . .

"MALICIOUS POSTERITY"

Mesmer, forced to leave Vienna after discovering how to cur even without his magnetic stone, went to Paris, where the academ refused to investigate his method scientifically:

> His enthusiastic patients, however, acclaim him; his followers, headed by the lawyer Bergasse, form a stock company to create an academy of his own "to repay to Mesmer the debt of humanity." The shares are over-subscribed. In the course of twelve months, more than 340,000 livres are collected. A large palace in Paris becomes Mesmer's clinic. In other French cities as well, Mesmer's pupils unite to form "Harmonious Societies." Mesmer has carried the day, he has become the fashion—a serious danger to any system. . . . Official science pronounces the death-sentence on Mesmerism, August 11, 1784, through an Academical Committee appointed by Louis XVI. . . . The committee solemnly declares the "nullity of magnetism, since the fluid of animal magnetism cannot be perceived by any of our senses." . . . Injustice pursues Mesmer even after death. A malicious posterity identified him with the swarm of charlatans, pseudo-psychics and clairvoyants who claim him. Unjustly! The true heirs of Mesmer are far remote from these. . . . One hundred years later the Paris Academy itself must recognize hypnotism as a mode of treatment. . . . Thus Lafayette was essentially right after all. "The secret of Mesmer was a grand discovery"—the discovery of the mighty power of psychotherapy.

But not in hypnotism will modern medicine find the "mighty power of psychotherapy."